

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LUFKIN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

ALEJANDRO GARCIA

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NUMBER 9:16-CR-00008-7-MAC

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PETITION FOR WARRANT
FOR OFFENDER UNDER SUPERVISION**

Pending is a “Petition for Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision” filed March 4, 2025, alleging that the Defendant, Alejandro Garcia, violated his conditions of supervised release. This matter is referred to the Honorable Christine L. Stetson, United States Magistrate Judge, for review, hearing, and submission of a report with recommended findings of fact and conclusions of law. *See United States v. Rodriguez*, 23 F.3d 919, 920 n.1 (5th Cir. 1994); *see also* 18 U.S.C. § 3401(i) (2000); E.D. TEX. CRIM. R. CR-59.

I. The Original Conviction and Sentence

Alejandro Garcia was sentenced on March 1, 2017, before The Honorable U.S. District Judge Ron Clark of the Eastern District of Texas after pleading guilty to the offense of Conspiracy to Distribute and to Possess with the Intent to Distribute 500 Grams or more but less than 5 Kilograms of Cocaine, a Class B felony. This offense carried a statutory maximum imprisonment term of 40 years. The guideline imprisonment range, based on a total offense level of 29 and a criminal history category of II, was 97 to 121 months. The court departed from the guideline range based on 4A1.3 Criminal History Inadequacy and 5K1.1 Substantial Assistance.

Garcia was subsequently sentenced to 66 months subject to the standard conditions of release, plus special conditions to include: access to financial information; drug abuse testing; and a \$100 special assessment.

II. The Period of Supervision

On April 2, 2021, Garcia completed his period of imprisonment and began service of the supervision term. The case was later reassigned to the Honorable U.S. District Judge Marcia A. Crone.

On April 30, 2024, Garcia's conditions of supervised release were modified to include participation in a mental health treatment program. On September 24, 2024, his conditions of supervised release were modified to include 180 days in a residential reentry center.

III. The Petition

United States Probation filed the Petition for Warrant for Offender Under Supervision raising one allegation. The petition alleges that Alejandro Garcia violated the following conditions of release:

Allegation 1. The Defendant must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance and submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter, as determined by the court.

IV. Proceedings

On April 29, 2025, the undersigned convened a hearing pursuant to Rule 32.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to hear evidence and arguments on whether the Defendant violated conditions of supervised release, and the appropriate course of action for any such violations.

At the revocation hearing, counsel for the Government and the Defendant announced an agreement as to a recommended disposition regarding the revocation. The Defendant agreed to plead "true" to the first allegation that claimed he failed to refrain from the unlawful use of a

controlled substance by submitting a urine specimen that tested positive for opiates on March 17, 2022, and admitting to the use of Hydrocodone. In return, the parties agreed that he should serve a term of 3 months' imprisonment with no supervised release to follow.

V. Principles of Analysis

According to Title 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3), the court may revoke a term of supervised release and require the defendant to serve in prison all or part of the term of supervised release authorized by statute for the offense that resulted in such term of supervised release without credit for time previously served on post-release supervision, if the court, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure applicable to revocation of probation or supervised release, finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant violated a condition of supervised release, except that a defendant whose term is revoked under this paragraph may not be required to serve on any such revocation more than five years in prison if the offense that resulted in the term of supervised release is a Class A felony, more than three years if such offense is a Class B felony, more than two years in prison if such offense is a Class C or D felony, or more than one year in any other case. The original offense of conviction was a Class B felony, therefore, the maximum imprisonment sentence is 3 years.

According to U.S.S.G. § 7B1.1(a)¹, if the court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendant violated conditions of supervision by failing to refrain from the unlawful use of a controlled substance, the Defendant will be guilty of committing a Grade C violation. U.S.S.G. § 7B1.3(a) indicates that upon a finding of a Grade A or B violation, the court shall revoke probation or supervised release, or upon the finding of a Grade C violation, the court may

1. All of the policy statements in Chapter 7 that govern sentences imposed upon revocation of supervised release are non-binding. See U.S.S.G. Ch. 7 Pt. A; *United States v. Bradberry*, 360 F. App'x. 508, 509 (5th Cir. 2009).

(A) revoke probation or supervised release; or (B) extend the term of probation or supervised release and/or modify the conditions of supervision.

U.S.S.G. § 7B1.4(a) provides that in the case of revocation of supervised release based on a Grade C violation and a criminal history category of II, the policy statement imprisonment range is 4 to 10 months.

According to U.S.S.G. § 7B1.3(c)(1), where the minimum term of imprisonment determined under U.S.S.G. § 7B1.4 is at least one month but not more than six months, the minimum term may be satisfied by (A) a sentence of imprisonment; or (B) a sentence of imprisonment that includes a term of supervised release with a condition that substitutes community confinement or home detention according to the schedule in U.S.S.G. § 5C1.1(e), for any portion of the minimum term.

In determining the Defendant's sentence, the court shall consider:

1. The nature and circumstance of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; *see* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1);
2. The need for the sentence imposed: to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct; to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and to provide the Defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, other corrective treatment in the most effective manner; *see* 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553 (a)(2)(B)-(D);
3. Applicable guidelines and policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission, for the appropriate application of the provisions when modifying or revoking supervised release pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(a)(3), that are in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; *see* 18 U.S.C. 3553(a)(4); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 924(A)(3);
4. Any pertinent policy statement issued by the Sentencing Commission, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(a)(2), that is in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; *see* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(5); and
5. The need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct; *see* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(6).
6. The need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

18 U.S.C. §§ 3583(e) and 3553(a).

VI. Application

The Defendant pled “true” to the petition’s allegation that he violated a mandatory condition of release that he failed to refrain from the unlawful use of a controlled substance by submitting a urine specimen that tested positive for opiates on March 17, 2022, and admitting to the use of Hydrocodone. Based upon the Defendant’s plea of “true” to this allegation of the Petition for Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision and U.S.S.G. § 7B1.1(a), the undersigned finds that the Defendant violated a condition of supervised release.

The undersigned has carefully considered each of the factors listed in 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e). The Defendant’s violation is a Grade C violation, and the criminal history category is II. The policy statement range in the Guidelines Manual is 4 to 10 months. The Defendant did not comply with the conditions of supervision and has demonstrated an unwillingness to adhere to conditions of supervision.

Consequently, incarceration appropriately addresses the Defendant’s violation. The sentencing objectives of punishment, deterrence and rehabilitation along with the aforementioned statutory sentencing factors will best be served by a prison sentence of 3 months with no supervised release to follow. The parties agree that a downward departure of one month is appropriate in this case because the Defendant’s time on supervised release is close to expiring, his candor with probation, probation’s recommendation, and due to his family situation.

VII. Recommendations

The court should find that the Defendant violated the allegation in the petition that he violated a mandatory condition of release by failing to refrain from the unlawful use of a controlled substance by submitting a urine specimen that tested positive for opiates on March 17, 2022, and admitting to the use of Hydrocodone. The petition should be granted, and the Defendant’s

supervised release should be revoked pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3583. The Defendant should be sentenced to a term of 3 months' imprisonment with no supervised release to follow. The Defendant's request should be accommodated, if possible.

VIII. Objections

At the close of the revocation hearing, the Defendant, defense counsel, and counsel for the government each signed a standard form waiving their right to object to the proposed findings and recommendations contained in this report, consenting to revocation of supervised release, and consenting to the imposition of the above sentence recommended in this report (involving all conditions of supervised release, if applicable). The Defendant also waived his right to be present and speak and have his counsel present and speak before the district court imposes the recommended sentence. Therefore, the court may act on this report and recommendation immediately.

SIGNED this the 29th day of April, 2025.



Christine L Stetson
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE